DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 266 RC 004 911

AUTHOR	Brown, Willie L., Jr.; And Others
TITLE	Thoughts on Diversity and Community in the Southwest with All Due Respect.
INSTITUTION	Southwest Intergroup Relations Council, Inc., Austin, Tex.
PUB DATE	Mar 70
NOTE	28p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southwest Intergroup Relations Council, Inc., 1503 Guadalupe - Suite 206, Austin, Texas 78701 ($1.00; bulk rates on request)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians, Cultural Pluralism, Education, *Mexican Americans, *Minority Groups, Nationalism, *Negroes, Power Structure, Racial Attitudes, Self Concept, *Social Attitudes, Social Discrimination, Socioeconomic Status

ABSTRACT

The authors of the 4 essays presented in this document expressing minority viewpoints are members of the Southwest Intergroup Relations Council, an organization established to highlight, through publication, problems of the minorities of the Southwest. The first entry, "Blacks, Browns, and Reds--Colors Far Apart," points out the rift between Blacks, Mexican Americans, and Indians as a result of the struggle for power in organizations and for control of Federal programs. The second article, "E Pluribus Unum: La Raza," takes a historical look at the plight of Mexican Americans who, as "original" owners of the land in the Southwest, are now deposed and have been forced to an image of a people in dire need of social and cultural rehabilitation. The essay "Indian and Other Tribes" presents the Indian viewpoint regarding the integrationist's theory of the melting pot as being applied to the Indian without regard to existing rights of tribes as sovereign communities. "Patterns of American Prejudice" is a report on a major study of contemporary anti-Semitism in the United States. The final essay, "Thoughts on the Dominant American," discusses the social science and literature of America being redundantly concerned with the fates and fortunes of the minorities while the social consciousness of the dominant American needs to be reassessed. (FL)

ED0 45266

WITH ALL DUE RESPECT
Thoughts on Diversity and Community in the Southwest

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CONTENTS

Page No.

Introduction 3

Blacks, Browns, and Reds–Colors Far Apart!
by Willie L. Brown, Jr. 5

E Pluribus Unum: La Raza
by Jorge Lara-Braud 9

Indian and Other Tribes
by Vine Deloria, Jr. 15

Patterns of American Prejudice
by Theodore Freedman 19

Thoughts on the Dominant American
by Mildred Dickeman 23

About the Authors 31

SOUTHWEST INTERGROUP RELATIONS COUNCIL, INC.
1503 Guadalupe – Suite 206
Austin, Texas 78701

Published by
THE SOUTHWEST INTERGROUP RELATIONS COUNCIL, INC.

". . . Promoting equality of opportunity for and mutual understanding, respect, and cooperation among all the people and groups of the Southwest."

ONE DOLLAR PER COPY
(BULK RATES ON REQUEST)

RC 00049 11

INTRODUCTION

THE SOUTHWEST Intergroup Relations Council, in keeping with its stated purpose, introduces these essays in order to promote "equality of opportunity for and mutual understanding, respect, and cooperation among all of the people and groups of the Southwest." A private, non-profit, educational and charitable agency, the S.I.R.C. is incorporated in Texas and works in an eight-state region including Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah. American Indians, Mexican-Americans, Afro-Americans, Anglo-Americans, and representatives of other ethnic groups of varying ages, religions, political affiliations, and economic conditions comprise its membership, which is drawn from leaders at all levels throughout the Region.

The essays are written by members of S.I.R.C. Willie L. Brown, Jr., a Black American, is a member of the California State Assembly from San Francisco. Jorge Lara-Braud is a native of Mexico, now in Austin, Texas, as Director of the Hispanic-American Institute, which is sponsored jointly by several Protestant denominations. Vine Deloria, Jr., a member of the Standing Rock Sioux tribe, is a former Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians, now studying law at the University of Colorado. Theodore Freedman is Director of the Houston Regional Office of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. Mildred Dickeman is chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California.

The bulk of the nation's Mexican-American population live in the Southwest, comprising fifteen percent (six million) of the region's population. There are about two and one-half million Black Americans in the Southwest – roughly eight percent of the population, about the same proportion as in any other region except the South. Approximately one-half of all American Indians live in the Southwest. Taken together, these three minorities make up about one-fourth of the region's people.

WHAT DR. LARA-BRAUD writes of Mexican-Americans could as well be said of all three of these groups: it is inaccurate to regard them as immigrant communities. For the forebears of each group, America was the land of opportunity – for someone else. Theirs were the resources appropriated and exploited. In one way or another each of these minorities is a conquered people. To them, as Mr. Deloria suggests with regard to Indians, the notion of "the melting pot" is not, never has been, and probably never will be applicable. Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Indians have known all along who they were, in a way that "the dominant American" (as the rest of us are designated by Dr. Dickeman) has not. For American Indians and Mexican-Americans the effort has been to preserve living cultures and identities. Black Americans, as Mr. Brown points out, "had their cultural ties and roots severed," leaving them no alternative but to attempt a re-creation of the non-cultural "mainstream American life" – to make the land habitable for the Blacks who exist in it. As they had little or nothing to conserve, it was perhaps to have been expected that Blacks would be more and sooner radical in seeking change.

It goes without saying (we hope) that the supercilious slogan "America: Love It or Leave It" is foolhardy. The option to remain "as is" is not on America's ballot. The criticism of the country implied in the demands of minority groups upon her is not a threat, but an offer of help in bringing her proud promise to fulfillment.

And, as Mr. Freedman suggests, creation of community founded on justice and characterized by genuine openness requires positive effort on the part of all of us. It is not in the interest of the dominant American (commonly and inexactly called the "Anglo" in the Southwest) to await with indifference the outcome of the struggle of any of the minorities. It is not in the interest of those belonging to any one minority to tolerate intolerance that does not affect their own case.

WE PUBLISH these views in order to highlight some issues and stimulate thought. We have not attempted to mold them into any

concensus, which would inevitably be a superficial one. We invited these individuals to write what was on their minds on the subject of relations among the groups of the Southwest with which they identify, and we have printed them as written, except for minor editing.

The reader should be aware, therefore, of very real disagreement among the writers. He also should anticipate, as we do, very divergent views from within their respective groups. Moreover, although each author is a member of the Southwest Intergroup Relations Council, the views they express do not necessarily represent those of the organization. The S.I.R.C. wants first of all to listen and try to understand and to facilitate listening and understanding by the people of the region and the nation. Our publication of these essays is one part of that process.

WITH ITS ETHNIC and cultural pluralism, the Southwest could be a very special proving ground for American democracy. Reasonableness in a many-sided discussion is at once easier and more necessary than in a two-way debate – and less likely to give way to bitter, fruitless quarreling. Each of the Region's minority groups has much to hear from the others. And dominant Americans have even more to overhear. To quote Dr. Dickeman again:

> . . . it may not be at all necessary for most Americans to be tolerant or unbiassed in order for our society to achieve a greater degree of justice and equality between individuals and between groups. But it may well be absolutely necessary for those in power to understand the roots of their own intolerance and its source in (the) American experience . . . in order that they have a sufficient, and sufficiently lasting, commitment to social reform.

This collection is addressed to this need – the need of all of us to understand and accept not only each other, but also ourselves – toward our coming together in mutual understanding, respect, and cooperation.

Mario Obledo, President
Southwest Intergroup Relations Council

March, 1970

Blacks, Browns, and Reds—Colors Far Apart

By WILLIE L. BROWN, JR.

IN FEBRUARY of 1970, a Mexican-American political convention was held for the express purpose of unifying the Mexican-American community in California on the question of which candidates should be endorsed for elections in predominantly Mexican-American populated districts. The tone of that convention and the statements made by the leadership of that convention lead one to believe that the Mexican-Americans, at least in California, are desirous of forming their own political party.

A month earlier an organization called the California Black Leadership Conference met at Asilomar by the Sea to explore the issues affecting the Black community; to assess the progress, if any, that had been made since the last time that body convened; and to engage in a dialogue with persons seeking a general endorsement of the California Black community. The California Black Leadership Conference is composed of any Black persons who desire to attend and any Black holding a leadership position in any organization, plus those who feel, by dint of some individual designation other than office in an organization, that they are in fact Black leaders.

The significance of these two meetings may not be fully known until sometime after the June 1970 primary in California, but the two meetings are clearly indicative of the wide gap which currently exists between Black Americans and the Latin community in California, with aspiring leaders of each group playing exclusively to their own audiences. To quote a delegate to the Congress of Mexican-American Unity, on the coming race for State Superintendent of Schools: "I think the voters should make up their own minds who should be the next superintendent of public instruction and not try to keep any candidate from running just because it might cause a rift between two ethnic groups." Then he goes on to say: "Either Nava (the Mexican-American candidate) or Riles (the Black candidate) would be better than Rafferty for minority students." If both run, as now seems probable, neither is likely to win without the support which the other will muster along ethnic lines; and conservative, white America will gain another political victory by default.

THE LARGE RIFT that exists between Blacks, Mexican-Americans and Indians is clearly typified in struggles for power in organizations and programs such as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Educational Opportunity Programs. In these struggles complaints by Mexican-Americans and Indians are, in the main, that too many Blacks are in positions of power in these organizations and programs, and consequently most of the energies are channeled and geared to the Blacks. Blacks respond to this valid observation by first pointing out that no other race of people has had visited upon it the deprivation which Blacks have experienced in this country. Secondly, they point out that it was the Blacks and the Blacks alone who engaged in the civil rights struggle of the late 'forties and the early 'fifties.

Blacks first moved very quietly through organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, then finally kicked over the traces via the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and the Congress of Racial Equality. The throwing of rocks and bottles, the jailings, the assassinations, the church bombings and the heightened activities in the area of confrontations, in the view of the Blacks, forced the concessions by way of the poverty programs and the educational assistance programs.

The Blacks believe that housing legislation, fair employment practices legislation and court decisions affirming civil rights and right to equal opportunity came as a direct result of Black action. Job training programs, expansion of welfare programs and similar projects were notably more available after Watts, Newark, Detroit, and other way-stations of violence that are pointed to with scorn by most Americans. Some Blacks even contend that these decisions were designed and made for Blacks only, and some Blacks are very critical of the lack of participation of Mexican-Americans and Indians in the battle that led to these gains. Blacks further point out that Blacks in

this nation are located in every state of the Union and in greater numbers in more of the states of the Union than any other minority.

THE DIFFERENCES and gaps which exist between Mexican-Americans, and more especially Indians, and Blacks in this country can be documented, and are based upon several differences in the cultural heritage and history of each.

Mexican-Americans, and more especially Indians, have and always have had cultures and roots which remained virtually intact. Blacks in this country, by virtue of their introduction to America through the institution of slavery, have had their cultural ties and roots severed. The enslavement of the Black in America could not have been successful without obliterating Black cultural traits and heritage. In one sense, the military conquest of the Indians and Mexican-Americans and the enslavement of the Blacks have left them each equally in economic, political and social subjugation. Nevertheless, the fight for parity – economic, political and social – has for some reason only been joined by the Blacks and their growing successes stand in sharp contrast to the Indians' and Mexican-Americans' attempts. For both of the latter groups, the course over the years has been one of decline.

What has prompted some success by Blacks in the struggle for parity and an obvious decline in parity by the other two groups? I suspect that the most distinguishing characteristic in the Blacks' struggle is that it has succeeded along the lines of traditional mainstream American goals. This is very possibly the result of not having a continuing culture to fall back upon. Secondly, statistics in terms of organizational structures such as CORE, NAACP, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Negro labor movement and other organizations attest to what appears to be a national cohesiveness which does not exist to the same degree among Indians and Mexican-Americans.

IF BLACKS, INDIANS and Mexican-Americans are to survive in this country and acquire some degree of parity politically, economically and socially, then they must find a common basis for dealing with the maker and perpetuator of their common problems. Indians and Mexican-Americans have legal claims to land and treaty right in this country. Blacks by virtue of their many years of involuntary servitude have a right to compensation for their labor. These respective claims are not inconsistent with each other and therefore represent a possible point of coalition.

The pathology resulting from white treatment of each group has been essentially the same. Any Black, Indian, or Mexican-American community will exhibit the same degree of poverty, the same inadequate mental and physical health care, the same internecine warfare over leadership, and the same intra-group class conflicts. In each group are found the high rates of suicide, alcoholism, and family instability characteristic of conquered peoples. Each group's pathology will also demonstrate the tokenism approach which has been white America's most clever method of dealing with its dispossessed and deprived minorities. The Black community, as well as the Indian and Mexican-American communities, in many areas views itself as a separate and distinct nation. It measures its group's strength in terms of a force for change and in many cases by pure numbers. In other areas, strength is measured by the tactical skills of a chosen few and, of course, by the political power that each leader, individually, may wield.

Blacks, Indians and Mexican-Americans have had essentially the same treatment and experience in the area of police brutality, inferior education, unemployment, welfare hand-outs, ghetto life, inadequate housing and the denial of basic human rights in this legal system.

With so much in common, it should be apparent that the three groups must begin to view themselves as one in the struggle against subjugation by the "majority." The strategy and tactics of change must be that strategy and those tactics which

reveal, rather than mask, a unity. Blacks must consider and realize that the breaking of a treaty with the Indians or the Mexican-Americans equals white racism in its worst form. Indians and Mexican-Americans must realize that militancy does not equal violence. Each of the groups must understand that human rights refer as much to the rights of a Black or a Mexican-American as they do to Indian tribal rights. A young Indian said, as reported in the February 9, 1970 issue of *Time* magazine. "Even the name Indian is not ours. It was given to us by some dumb honky who got lost and thought he had landed in India. We weren't meant to be tourist attractions for the master race. Some day you are going to feel like Custer, baby." Translated, that statement could have been made by a Black Panther as well as a Brown Beret, by someone from Chavez' movement as well as someone from the Congress of Racial Equality.

THE BLACK, BROWN, and Red groups are not enemies. The threat is from without, and is common to all of them. That poverty and ill health continue within each is due in part to their inability to project programs comprehensive enough to unify the three groups, as well as others, in support of them. Half-way measures of justice and conscience-salving tokenism are white America's weapons. Blacks, Browns, and Reds should not let them be used on each other.

E Pluribus Unum: La Raza

By JORGE LARA-BRAUD

"The Land Was Ours Before We Were The Land's"

For many reasons it would be inaccurate to regard the ten million Hispanic-Americans who live in the United States as an immigrant community. Close to 90% of them are U.S. citizens. Hispanic-Americans, persons who in any way trace their ancestry back to Spain or Latin America or both, constitute the second largest ethnic minority in the U.S.A. About six million are Mexican-Americans located primarily in the Southwest. California and Texas each have more than two million Mexican-American residents, and there are considerable concentrations in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Michigan and Ohio. Some 200,000 Spanish-Americans, direct descendants of the original Spanish settlers, are found mostly in northern New Mexico, southern Colorado, northern California, and parts of Nevada and Utah. There are approximately one and a half million Puerto Ricans, located mostly in New York City and the Chicago area, and 400,000 Cubans, two-thirds of whom are situated in Miami. "Freedom flights" from Cuba bring about 1,000 per week, most of whom are now immediately relocated outside Miami. Every other Latin American country is represented substantially in the remaining million and a half, either by recent arrivals or by second or third generation natives with Hispanic ancestry. Almost every U.S. city larger than 100,000 has a recognizable Spanish-speaking enclave.

Contrary to popular belief, immigration from Latin America, except for the quite exceptional case of Cubans, may now have reached an all-time low. As of July 1, 1968, the new U.S. immigration law puts a limit of 20,000 immigrants from any single independent country in one year, with a total allowable of 120,000 for the Western Hemisphere, formerly under non-quota classification and no numerical limit. Since 1930, immigration from Mexico, the largest from Latin America across the years, has not exceeded the 1963 peak of about 56,000 for a twelve-month period.

BY FAR THE MOST significant factor in the non-immigrant character of Spanish-speaking people in the U.S.A. is the plain historical fact that they were here long before the Pilgrims or Puritans made their appearance. Robert Frost's famous line may legitimately be reversed by Hispanic-Americans: "The land was ours before we were the land's." Unfortunately, it was by military conquest that the first Spanish-speaking U.S. citizens became "the land's." Former Mexican and Spanish citizens were left no choice by their defeat in the Texas War of Independence of 1836, the Mexican War of 1846-48, and the Spanish-American War of 1898. History teaches us that conquered people have a way of gradually being reduced to humble hewers of wood and drawers of water. Eventually, a convenient stereotype builds around them: Simple, childlike, indolent folk requiring no more than the bare essentials of life, a periodic fiesta or two, and the timely application of legal and economic force when deviancy from the mainstream transcends the tolerance of a society bent on melting differences away.

The ranks of conquered Hispanic-American people were later swelled by several waves of refugee immigration, as early as 1910-1925 when Mexicans fled the Revolution and its aftermath, and as late as 1959-1970 when many Cubans abandoned their island to Castro's Marxist experiment. Other waves of poor Mexican and Puerto Rican immigrants have come and gone since the 1920's, in proportion to the U.S. demand for cheap agricultural and factory labor. "Prestige" immigration from Latin America has been minimal. Even when immigrants have previously held skilled professional and managerial positions, as has been the experience of many Cubans, of necessity their first few years in the land are heavy with the psychology of displacement and their initiation as welfare recipients. The combined legacy of military conquest, cheap foreign labor, and exile immigration, not surprisingly, has created an image of a people in dire need of social and cultural rehabilitation prior to admission to full-fledged U.S. citizenship.

8/9

Not Rehabilitation But Self-Determination

Hispanic-Americans, however, have repudiated the idea of rehabilitation as a condition for their share in the American Dream. In fact, it may be truthfully said that no other group has more generously amplified the principle on which that dream is based: "from the many one" (*e pluribus unum*). As an ethnic family, it encompasses the whole gamut of the racial strains known to man, indianhood being its most basic component, and Spanish the language of its soul. What it pleads is the acceptance of its inner diversity by the larger society, while pledging its unconditional loyalty to a free, democratic, and *pluralistic* United States of America. The disproportionate record of heroism and casualties of the Spanish-speaking in the last three major U.S. wars will forever stand as a memorial to their unwavering allegiance to their country.

Whether it is racism, or intolerance to difference, or superficial and conditional tolerance, the fact remains that this country has proven hostile to the Hispanic-American style of selective assimilation. Harold Howe II, immediate past U.S. Commissioner of Education, is quite correct in deploring this "Cowboys vs. Indians" mentality which assumes that–

> . . . Other cultures are not merely *different*; they are inferior. They must be wiped out . . . In a hundred subtle ways, we have told people of all origins other than English that their backgrounds are somehow cheap and humorous. And the tragic thing is that this process has succeeded. Of the incredible diversity of languages and traditions that the people of a hundred nations brought to this country, virtually nothing remains, except in scattered enclaves . . . more often viewed as objects of curiosity rather than respect. (from "Cowboys, Indians and American Education." Address given at the National Conference on Educational Opportunities for Mexican-Americans. Austin, Texas. April 25, 1968).

Schools, churches, employers, government and law enforcement agencies seem to have been guided by the assumption of rehabilitation, i.e., "Americanization," in an attempt to incorporate Spanish-speaking citizens within the homogenized national mainstream. The argument is simple: other "language" minorities have been able to blend almost imperceptibly into the so-called American melting pot, why not the Spanish-speaking? Surely, according to this argument, it is in the best interest to assimilate in a fashion similar to every other patriotic minority.

WHAT APPARENTLY escapes these well-intentioned cultural homogenizers is that *the parallel between Hispanic-Americans and other language minorities in the U.S.A. turns out to be no parallel at all.* The living organism of Hispanic-American culture was already deeply rooted in U.S. soil a good many years before the arrival of the Mayflower. Despite the traumas of military conquest, of dispossession from lands by legal chicanery, of prejudicial treatment of cheap laborers, and condescending acceptance of bewildered exiles, the very blood stream of the Spanish-speaking organism has never ceased to be replenished. Because they or their ancestors came from neighboring countries, the Spanish-speaking in this country – particularly Mexican-Americans in the Southwest – have never been as isolated from the fountains of their cultural stream as other immigrant groups were.

Meanwhile, Latin America has been rediscovered south and *north* of the Rio Grande following the tremors of the Cuban revolution. Being a Spanish-English bilingual is no longer quaint or un-American. Practically all major institutions of higher learning have initiated programs of Latin American studies, and in the new climate of hemispheric interaction, it is not surprising to find that in the fiscal year 1967-68 there were nearly 140 million border crossings made from Mexico into the United States, and in excess of 100 million from the U.S.A. into Mexico. And, in Miami alone, more than 400 flights entering the U.S. from Latin America are recorded every week, exclusive of the freedom flights from Cuba. Even if new immigration from Latin American countries may have

reached an all-time low, the marvels of modern transportation have greatly accelerated an intense transient bicultural and bilingual traffic in the Americas.

The Pathology of Repression And The Healing Of Tradition

The question is whether the U.S.A. will continue its policy of cultural genocide, perhaps unwitting, towards its Hispanic-Americans, or whether it will live up for the first time to its cherished ideal of pluralism, allowing this important community to enrich the country and itself through the renaissance of its rich cultural traditions. Nothing would make more sense in a nation rent asunder by the ugly legacy of racism.

The children of Cuauhtémoc and Atahualpa, el Cid and Don Quijote, of Hidalgo and Bolívar, of Juárez and Martí, of Nervo and Darío, of the black San Martín de Porres, the Indian Virgin of Guadalupe, and the blond European Madonnas have brought with them the healing of their humanistic traditions. A true Hispanic-American knows no racial prejudice, holds sacred human life over "humane" causes, puts honor before gain, defers to the wisdom of the old over the fads of the young, affirms the primacy of being over doing, struggles against the machine's tyranny over human existence, values freedom more than life when his native or adopted country is threatened with aggression.

Thus, when a Mexican-American cries "Viva la Raza!" or speaks of "La Raza Unida," he celebrates not the hope of ethnic hegemony, but the hope of triumph by all humanity over all that dehumanizes, over all forms of tyranny. He celebrates October 12, not so much as Columbus Day, but as a symbol of the New World's promise of universal freedom, human dignity and human solidarity. It is "El día de la Raza."

TRAGICALLY, THE DAY of renaissance has not dawned. Instead, the majority of Hispanic-Americans grope for the dawning of that day amidst the darkness of repression. Their destitution in a country enjoying unprecedented prosperity bespeaks their endurance and the insensitivity of their would-be rehabilitators. Helen Rowan, writing on the plight of the largest group among Hispanic-Americans in "A Minority Nobody Knows" (*Atlantic Monthly*, June 1967), does not overstate the case:

> Census statistics and other studies show the Mexican-Americans of the Southwest to be worse off in every respect than non-whites, not to mention the dominant Anglos. The Mexican-Americans are poorer, their housing is more crowded and dilapidated, their unemployment rate is higher, their average educational level is lower, their school drop-out rate is higher than that of any other group; and very few of those who graduate from high school move on to college.

IT IS NO oversimplification to state that this destitution is directly related to an institutionalized system of rewards and punishments based on the relative success or failure with which one can abandon his "foreign" ways and adopt those more typical of the homogenized mainstream. Even then, those who so "succeed" more often than not discover that despite the silent trauma of self-denial, they have not quite arrived. Their physical features, the remnants of an accent, their Spanish surname still identify them with the vast "un-rehabilitated" mass of the blood kin from whom they mistakenly thought they had divorced themselves. The results are frequently pathological. "Success" types are driven farther and farther apart from their ethnic family, being promoted as exemplary by those who believe in the "melting pot" myth. Few can escape the inner sense, or the outer denunciation, of a sell-out.

Under such conditions, self-hatred is inevitable, and self-justification indispensable. When the alienated "success" type is put in a position of authority over his own ethnic family, an appalling miscarriage of justice often results. For in the mirror of the name, face, speech, dwelling and ways of those "unfit" people, his self-rejected image is magnified a thousand fold. The mirror or his "success" must go. He cannot have it both

ways. Much regret has been expressed about lack of leaders among Hispanic-Americans. If by leaders we mean those rewarded with positions of power for rejecting or suppressing their ethnic family, then we should all rejoice for their shortage or weep for their abundance.

The Choice of Leadership

Nevertheless, genuine leadership – by Hispanic-Americans with undeniable charisma – has come to the fore, aided by the impetus and example of more than a decade of the struggle for human rights led by Black Americans. It is particularly among Hispanic-Americans of Mexican descent that nationally recognized leaders have emerged. The most celebrated and revered is Cesar Chávez, 42 years old, an unusual blend of saintliness and sagacity. A devout Roman Catholic, he is unalterably committed to non-violence. Chávez attained national renown when in the fall of 1965 he began the still unended strike of Filipino and Mexican-American farm workers against grape growers in the San Joaquin Valley of California. After a bitter struggle his fledgling United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, AFL-CIO has successfully negotiated 11 contracts with major winegrape growers. He faces, however, a much tougher challenge with table grape growers in the same area, who raise 90% of the U.S. crop. The growers have traded brands among themselves in an attempt to keep any of them from being singled out for a boycott effort. Chávez has seen no recourse but to declare a national boycott against *all* California table grapes. An indication of his popularity is the endorsement he has received from the overwhelming majority of Hispanic-Americans throughout the country, the General Board of the National Council of Churches, many individual Roman Catholic bishops, numerous Jewish religious figures and organizations, a number of large municipalities (among them New York City, Boston, and Minneapolis), and scores of students and clergymen of all ethic groups who assiduously manage picket lines in many major U.S. cities. But just as the boycott was beginning seriously to hurt grape sales, it was discovered the Armed Services had greatly multiplied their grape requisitions for Vietnam, from 468,000 pounds in 1966-67, to 555,000 in 1967-68, to an estimated 4,000,000 in 1968-69. Despite a campaign of letter-writing to congressmen, picketing of freighters bound for Vietnam, and a hearing by a congressional committee, there has been no redress.

Chávez' struggle as a symbol of redress of grievances for the Spanish-speaking cannot be overestimated. He has challenged practically every U.S. power and principality inimical to their self-determination. Hence, his name, picture, union banner and slogans make their appearance in every other struggle of the Spanish-Speaking: rural and urban strikes, efforts for collective bargaining, demands for bilingual education, voter registration drives, restraint of biased law enforcement agencies, proportional representation in juries, draft and school boards, exclusion of cheap (legal) "commuter" labor from Mexico, covering of farm workers under the 1935 National Labor Relations Act (from which they have been specifically excluded), non-discriminatory practices in general employment and promotions, and an end to the excessively large number of the Hispanic-American youth drafted for service in Vietnam.

A QUITE DIFFERENT charismatic person with a growing following of militants is the fiery spellbinder and former Pentecostal preacher, 43-year-old Reies López Tijerina. Called the "King Tiger," Tijerina has founded the Alianza Federal de Mercedes (Federal Alliance of Free City States) in an attempt to reclaim the millions of acres of communally-owned land in northern New Mexico and southern Colorado allegedly taken away from Spanish-Americans by "Anglos" and by the U.S. government through legal trickery, in violation of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo of 1848, which protected the ownership of such lands in perpetuity. No group among the Spanish-speaking have felt more bitterly the sense of military conquest and dispossession. Understandably, Tijerina has touched a responsive chord. His following is not

large, for many recoil from the insinuation of counter-violence in his potent diatribes against Uncle Sam and Anglo "devils;" but it is keeping alive a long-standing grievance which will fester until some semblance of redress has been obtained.

Another Mexican-American militant of superb gifts is Rodolfo ("Corky") González, 41 years old, of Denver, Colorado, founder of the 1,800 member Crusade for Justice. This organization is devoted to legal defense, Indo-Hispanic cultural reassertion, and cultivation of Mexican-American talent for pictorial, plastic and dramatic arts. Tijerina and González, with leaders of the 20,000 member Mexican-American Political Association (MAPA), are the architects of a coalition with militant black organizations of the West Coast. Presumably there is a united front made up of their three Mexican-American organizations and chapters of CORE, SNCC, and other black militants. We say "presumably" because the coalition is at times more verbal than actual, more mutually protective than jointly decisive, more crisis-oriented than comprehensively strategic. The Black and Mexican-American rank and file consider the arrangement a tactical necessity for situations of special duress. Of course, the truly disaffected, in a relentless struggle against overly zealous police, exist in permanent duress. For them the coalition is a de facto reality. This is particularly true in Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area, but with no noticeable projections to other parts of the Southwest. Their numbers in sustained concerted action are modest by any account.

THE FACT OF the matter is that Blacks and Mexican-Americans barely know each other. A system insensitive to minorities has made them unwitting opponents in the struggle for countervailing power against the bigoted Anglo or the Uncle Tom (or Tío Tomás). Open hostilities between the two minorities are not unusual, until the word begins to spread that their respected elders are uniting. Still, it will be a long time before the majority in each community will give top priority to alliance with the other. The Blacks are generally of the opinion that Mexican-Americans lag at least a decade behind in the assertion of their rights. Mexican-Americans will have to heal their many divisions and define their own style of self-determination before they are ready for inter-ethnic alliances or are welcome by the more aggressive ethnic group as a coalitional asset.

The Possible Dream

By far the most satisfactory solution for the future of the Spanish-speaking in the U.S. is to work hard and together at obtaining redress in all the areas where they have been deprived not only of basic rights, but of the more fundamental right to be a rich bilingual and bicultural community. As with individuals, a community becomes destructive of itself and others when it looks after its survival alone. Of all ethnic families in the U.S.A., the Spanish-speaking are by virtue of their variety, from the Negroid to the Teutonic, in the unique position of exemplifying by their unity the fraternity of all men. Their concept of La Raza makes them receptive to the mutual enrichment of all peoples and traditions. Naturally, this cannot be accomplished in the absence of justice.

Happily, countless men of good will in every other ethnic group are ready to lend their support in making the dream come true. Witness the nation-wide endorsement of Chávez' boycott, and the creation of two Ford Foundation-funded Mexican-American organizations of considerable influence. One is the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Educational Fund begun in May of 1968, already winning significant test cases in education and law enforcement and training a new generation of civil rights lawyers. The other is the Southwest Council of La Raza, a highly effective funding and coordinating body for grass roots efforts in community organization.

DURING DECEMBER 9-14, 1968, hearings on Mexican-Americans were held by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in San Antonio, Texas. They provided a national forum to reveal what this long-suffering minority has endured: biased admin-

istration of justice, exploitation of farm laborers, inhuman mismanagement of welfare programs, and inferior education. Legal action and corrective legislation are bound to result. Not the least encouraging feature of these hearing was the courageous testimony presented by prominent Anglos and Blacks, along with Mexican-Americans, and the growing evidence of affirmative programs of bilingual education, economic development, and retraining and employment already underway. The dream may yet come true. If and when "La Raza Unida" is fully realized, it will add a large measure of sanity to the whole of U.S. society, and, by extension, to the rest of the world as well.

Indian and Other Tribes

By VINE DELORIA, JR.

WHEN AN INDIAN speaks, it is difficult for him to extract himself from his community in order to raise issues that appear to have overwhelming importance for the many groups of Americans. Almost immediately the cry goes out across the land that so-and-so is attempting to speak for Indians. At the outset it should be clear that tribal councils, in formal sessions, by resolutions, speak for their tribes and no one else can or does speak FOR Indians.

But it is not invalid to speak OF Indians. A great many issues run through the moccasin telegraph. These can be picked up and presented for discussion with the understanding that eventually one must face the tribe in all its aspects and if the tribe rejects the ideas and programs put forth for its examination then the tribe has spoken and the subject is closed until another day.

THERE HAS NEVER been a compelling reason for Indian people to cooperate with any other group, listen to any other group, or attempt to understand any other group. The history of America has been a series of betrayals and treacherous activities on the part of other groups toward Indian people. As long as other groups are considered potential invaders of Indian lands they will be viewed with distrust and misunderstanding. And as long as the appropriation of Indian lands and rights by some groups continues, *all* outsiders will bear the burden of Indian distrust. This too should be clear at the outset.

It would be fair to state, however, that much of the distrust has arisen because the abolition of Indian tribes and communities has been justified by certain philosophical and sociological ideas and that the major advocates and activists promoting these theories have been whites and blacks. Mexicans for the most part, although Indians have not forgotten the Spanish conquest of the Southwest, have had a much closer philosophical relationship to Indian people.

When we speak of certain ideas creating distrust, we specifically mean the traditional integrationist theory of the MELTING POT. This theory has been applied without regard to existing rights of Indian tribes as sovereign communities, in an effort to "give" to Indian peoples all the "rights" and "privileges" which the white and black communities hold dear – the sum of which seems to be alienation of the individual. On the basis of integration-assimilation-equality, tribal land holdings were confiscated by the federal government. Tribes were destroyed and their members were made strangers in their own land. Communities were ripped apart and their peoples were driven into city slums to linger and die.

It would be well for other groups of Americans to understand that so many times have Indian people been told the blessings of integration and assimilation and so many times have they been stripped of their lands that any mention of the mainstream of American life is sure to evoke a bitter reaction and suspicion of the speaker. No longer do Indian people even attempt to argue about the mainstream and its blessings. They almost immediately turn off and the conversation is ended.

YET, BEYOND THIS understandable cynicism, Indian people admittedly have much in common with other groups, particularly those groups composing and represented in the Southwest Intergroup Relations Council. Precisely because the S.I.R.C. is structured as it is, there is finally a chance for Indian people to communicate the vital issues of their community in a context that is not only intelligible to other groups but in which the Indian life-style makes a great deal of sense.

From the founding of the Republic until 1966 the emphasis was, as noted above, the integration of the individual and the careful avoidance of any recognition of the group to which he belonged. Only Indian tribes, because of their formal treaty agreements with the federal government, received any recognition as a distinct group; and those tribal groups suffered every conceivable indignity for maintaining their own group identity. But maintain it they did, and in so doing proclaimed that to have group identity is a valid social goal.

In 1966 Stokely Carmichael, on the continuation of The Meredith March in Mississippi, raised the battle cry of "Black Power." In a subsequent book of the same title Carmichael and Charles Hamilton outlined the philosophy of the group as it was understood in the Black community by militant young Blacks. From this point the philosophies of Indian nationalism and Black militancy have been riding side by side, and they probably will for the next decade. And this is so, even though the language has been different, the technical vocabulary has prevented direct communication, and the tactics of each group have driven the masses of the one community away from the masses of the other.

In 1968 the Poor People's Campaign was launched with Black leadership and attracted a number of people from every ethnic and racial community. About 50 Indians joined the Poor People's Campaign and participated in the events in Washington, D.C. These people did not in any respect represent the Indian community but went as individuals who felt a need to participate. Most of the participants made this absolutely clear to their tribal councils and local communities and, although their behavior was declared "un-Indian," for the most part they were not ostracized for their participation.

The Indian participants were not representative of the Indian community because the issue of poverty and the tactics by which poverty can be overcome are entirely different in an Indian setting from what they are in any other group. Thus the vocabulary used to explain the Poor People's March, the tactic of militant marches, and the mood of the campaign were new phenomena among Indian people; and they had not had a chance to absorb the novelty of the situation and come to a consensus concerning it.

Additionally, there was a great fear among Indian people that the organizers of the march were basing the potential coalition of racial and ethnic groups on a focus too narrow to have impact – economics. Extreme skepticism was felt even among very nationalistic Indian leadership that a coalition could be formed around a negative value such as deprivation. Many felt that any coalition of diverse groups had to be formed around certain basic understandings of "the group itself" rather than in terms of the income of the average individual within the group.

The range of poverty among Indian tribes is extreme. Some have sufficient resources to support themselves in a style to which the majority of whites have not yet become accustomed – this is done by per capita distribution of oil royalties. Other tribes such as the Havasupai, Tunica, and Burns Paiute have so little that they are barely able to survive at all. Economics could hardly be a rallying idea for Indian people. The diverse development schemes undertaken for reservation people eloquently demonstrate this fact.

THE IMPORTANT ASPECT of Indian affairs which other groups always seem to miss is their tacit recognition of the sovereignty of the group and their determination to be a particular "people" in a particular place at the particular time. A substantial number of tribal names (Dakota, Navajo, Chippewa) mean "the People." The whole system of Indian survival is built upon a view of life in which the people dominate themselves by the awareness that they are set apart as a special group. When this is seen in the political arena it means that the mass of people will not move individually on any given issue. It also means that the whole community moves when it commits itself to a course of action. Since the other groups in America have not recognized this Indian emphasis upon the sovereignty of the group, a missing link of communication exists between them and Indian people.

Other groups may reply that this is only one aspect of the problem, and indeed it is. In America, the Black community, for example, is 20 times as numerous as the Indian community. There are more Blacks in New York City, even more Jews, than there are Indians in the United States. There is a question, therefore, of weighting issues according to population because in American society might always makes right. God is on the side of the big battalions, as Napoleon used to say.

Numbers may dictate tactics but they do not communicate issues. A group that is able to put

100,000 people into the streets of Washington, D.C. can affect policies if it is absolutely sure it wants those policies. But having numbers does not necessarily mean that the group knows what it is doing – as the failure of the Poor People's Campaign indicates. In contrast, because of the recognition of the sovereignty of the group, Indians have the opportunity to bring intangible values to the table of discussion and have them accepted or rejected even though they are not backed by numbers.

NATIONALLY, THE INDIAN community experiences the same problem of diversity as that between racial groups. Some tribes are larger than others. Some are richer than others. As the Indian community has built its major national organization over the past 25 years, it has developed a means of recognizing both numbers of people and the sovereignty of its component groups. By this means it has been able to keep a fairly united community together on the major issues confronting Indian people and still allow the dissidents to promote whatever views their consciences or quirks dictate.

This National Congress of American Indians has a two-fold voting schedule. At its annual convention votes for member-tribes are apportioned on a sliding scale of from 10 to 18 votes according to population. Thus the large tribes have nearly twice the voting strength of the smaller tribes. But the smaller tribes are not shut out altogether. The Cherokees of Oklahoma with 41,000 members have 18 votes, the Mission Creek Indians of California with 15 members have 10 votes. Thus, within those extremes, there is some effort to account for difference in tribal population.

All officers of the N.C.A.I. are elected on the floor of the convention, except for the Executive Director and Treasurer. The N.C.A.I. has an Executive Council designed to make policies and programs between conventions, but without authority to overturn a convention resolution. Each tribe, no matter how large or small, has one vote on the Executive Council. The Executive Director and Treasurer, the two major administrative officers, are elected by this representative Executive Council and thus are immediately tied to the formal tribal structure. They have to listen to the official positions of the respective tribes or soon find themselves out of office.

The system works in twofold aspect. Major policy positions are made on the convention floor by tribes voting as sovereign units and by individual members of the organization. Anyone can submit a resolution to the convention floor by being a member in good standing. The majority of individual votes always determines the outcome of the elections of President, Vice President and Recording Secretary. But development of strategy for work to be done during the year must be submitted to the Executive Council for approval. Thus the sovereignty of the individual tribe is protected by its membership on the Executive Council as it participates in the planning which implements the wishes of the convention.

THE INDIAN COMMUNITY is not, therefore, formally committed to any particular tactic by which issues can be raised. Rather, it is committed to a general strategy by which issues are communicated to all members of the community. In time of crisis, because there is general understanding of the issues, there can be a nearly unanimous consent to philosophy and tactics to be used to combat that particular crisis. No better example can be used than the struggle in 1967 over the Omnibus Bill submitted by the Department of the Interior. Indian people almost unanimously opposed the bill. They reacted almost instantaneously and there was little need even to discuss tactics. The bill was defeated. A subsequent attempt to pass its basic provisions in six smaller bills was also defeated.

The convention at Albuquerque in 1969 was attended by every segment of the Indian community – traditionalists, activists, conservatives, moderates. There was nearly unanimous accord as to important issues and a highlighting of the events and incidents which the national Indian community would consider acts of aggression by non-Indians. Demonstrators, if they got out of

hand, would be barred from future conventions. Pyramid Lake's water rights would be the cutting edge by which the sincerity of the Nixon administration would be judged. Traditionalists (Indians who are radically conservative of tribal ways and traditions) would henceforth receive the utmost attention among Indian people with legal rights of tribes protected in all aspects – taxation, fishing and hunting rights, wild rice. The non-federal Indian communities of the southeastern United States would receive much more assistance from the N.C.A.I. With this solidarity of purpose and understanding, the Indian people left Albuquerque still not committed to an inexorable course of action and with sufficient flexibility to meet the threats of the coming year.

RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM seems to be highly prized in America, and it is difficult, apparently, for most Americans to understand the importance of corporate identity and tribal sovereignty to American Indians. To understand it is vitally important, however, for any groups seeking coalition with Indians. We may take the Southwest Intergroup Relations Council as an example.

If the groups composing the Council understand the process by which sovereign Indian groups raise and settle issues among themselves, they should be able to translate this into the nature of the approach that must be taken toward Indians if there is to be a meaningful coalition of all groups of the Southwest. With meaningful communication to tribal governing bodies there can be a groundswell of solid support from Indian people for some projects. Without such effort there can be no meaningful support.

Additionally, there is the question of actions of conscience by Indian individuals, apart from tribal expressions. These are important as a complement of relevant action. By gaining a consensus from the individual Indian members of the S.I.R.C., the organization can discover the extent to which any issue can be communicated to the larger Indian community. Thus the members of S.I.R.C. will know when they can realisitically expect support from the total Indian community and when little or no support can be anticipated.

A great deal of energy should be spent, as it must in any coalition, to translate concepts and vocabulary from one system of thought to another. It is not enough to find "white racism" behind treaty violations, for tagging the phenomenon simply as racism may well alienate older members of the Indian community who would feel that the word has "black" connotations. It would be far better simply to understand that the breaking of the treaty, in the eyes of the Indian people, is identification enough of causes. A similar case exists with respect to the word "militant" which many Indians feel has overtones of violence. In fact calling an Iroquois a "militant" is the quickest way to gain introduction to the other world.

THE PURPOSEFUL COALITION of S.I.R.C., based as it is upon equality of each group in its sovereign aspect, can effect tremendous conceptual changes in each group. This in turn can result in intelligent activism on a fruitful and progressive basis. S.I.R.C. should become the cauldron in which concepts are tested and technical vocabulary devised to communicate to each group the issues at stake. If we are able to maintain a willingness to listen to each other, to learn the words we are all using and what they mean both in our own context and in the context of another living community, it may be that S.I.R.C. can be one of the Southwest's most influential organizations in the last three decades of this century.

Patterns of American Prejudice

By THEODORE FREEDMAN

A major study of contemporary anti-Semitism in the United States has found that such prejudice is "firmly anchored in a whole system of generally unenlightened beliefs and weak commitment to democracy and the implications go beyond anti-Semitism to reveal a potential danger to the nation itself."

The study, conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of California under a grant from the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, is the first intensive analysis of the extent and kind of anti-Semitism in the United States today. It reveals that:

–over a third of the population is anti-Semitic;

–the majority of the other two-thirds are marked by apathy;

–overt anti-Jewish discrimination is low but negative attitudes remain deeply ingrained and widely accepted;

–simplistic beliefs, ignorance and low tolerance for social and political diversity go hand in hand with anti-Semitism;

–these tendencies characterize large numbers of Americans;

–given a crisis situation and demagogic political leadership, they constitute a threat to the whole country.

To focus solely on anti-Semitic *beliefs* would exaggerate the extent of the problem, to focus solely on *acts* of discrimination would minimize it.

THE SOCIOLOGISTS at the Survey Research Center used three criteria to measure the continued viability of anti-Semitism: the degree of acceptance of 1) anti-Semitic beliefs and stereotypes; 2) social club discrimination, and 3) political anti-Semitism. They found "a sizable reservoir of anti-Semitic beliefs and stereotypes, wide acceptance of social club discrimination, and substantial susceptibility to political anti-Semitism."

According to the analysis, there is an unprejudiced third of the population virtually free of anti-Semitic beliefs and another third that holds some of the less noxious stereotypes of Jews. But it was found that:

–37% of the population have a negative image of Jews based on old canards that Jews control international banking, engage in shady business practices, are too powerful, too shrewd and tricky, too clannish, too ambitious, too bossy, and are less loyal to America than are other citizens.

–More than 25% defend the right of social clubs to exclude Jews. Another 29%, while opposed in principle, would do little or nothing to combat social club discrimination in practice. A minority of 36% was firmly opposed.

–Only 5% said they would vote for an anti-Semitic candidate, but over a third said the candidate's anti-Semitism would make no difference to them.

–Indifference to both political anti-Semitism and social club discrimination was common among the least prejudiced third of the population.

–Only 16% rejected all three of the sociologists' criteria for anti-Semitism. The 16%, according to the study, constitutes the small minority which can be described as "principled and consistent opponents of anti-Semitism."

THE WIDE GAP which exists between declining support for overt anti-Jewish discrimination and continuing acceptance of anti-Semitic beliefs demonstrates that "anti-discrimination laws have removed the top of the weed of prejudice without destroying the root."

The lesson of the Nazi holocaust is that in times of stress the power of the anti-Semite is easily increased, not by those who are highly intolerant of Jews, but by those who tolerate anti-Semitism.

As an illustration, an anti-Semitic candidate with a promised economic solution during a crisis period might gain the votes of *all* those susceptible to political anti-Semitism – the 5% who said they would vote for an anti-Semitic candidate, the more than a third who said the candidate's anti-Semitism would not matter, plus uncountable fellow travelers who make up the indifferent majority.

Although the study called education "the factor most powerfully related to prejudice" and anti-Semitism was found to be typically low among college graduates, the college-educated with high income and high occupational status were cited as heavy supporters of social club discrimination. The conclusion was that college education in itself was not the solution for striking down prejudiced attitudes but rather the *kind* of college education.

IT THUS BECOMES apparent that the quality and substance of education make a difference, for the study notes that some specialized fields are apt to produce high income and occupational status but that the college education leading to these ends supplies *technical* knowledge without producing a strong commitment to democratic values.

The study found greater anti-Semitism among older people and attributed it to the relatively lower level of education they received than do the young of today. Among religious groups, liberal Protestant denominations – Unitarian, Congregationalist, Episcopalian – were found to be lower on anti-Semitism (24%) and higher on college attendance (62%) than either Catholics or conservative Protestant denominations – Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, Lutheran, Evangelical and Reformed, Disciples of Christ, and sects. Catholics scored 35% on anti-Semitism and 21% on college attendance. Among conservative Protestants, 46% were anti-Semitic, 23% had attended college. The rural South and Midwest, found to be higher on anti-Semitism, are also areas which are lower on education. But college graduates in the rural South and Midwest were found to be no more likely to be anti-Semitic than college graduates elsewhere.

AMONG NEGROES, as among whites, greater education was associated with lower rates of anti-Semitism. But since Negroes generally have had much less education than whites their attitudes toward Jews received special attention. It was found that feelings about Jews seemed to stem largely from "the Negro's unique place in American society and the Jew's unique place in Negro ghetto life."

The study reveals that Negroes are a good deal less likely than whites to hold discriminatory attitudes toward Jews. Almost all – 91% – were against anti-Jewish social club discrimination and 67% – twice the percentage for whites – were willing to combat it in practice as well as in principle. Eighty-nine percent were against anti-Jewish employment discrimination – 19% higher than the figure for whites. More black citizens than white – 68% against 51% – said they would not be disturbed if a Jew were nominated for President.

But, in contrast to the lack of active discrimination among Negroes toward Jews, the impact of anti-Semitic stereotypes which to some degree characterize every segment of American white society, coupled with the Negro's special role in that society, have combined to make Negroes more anti-Semitic than whites in the stereotypes they hold about Jews and the *economic* arena.

ON MOST NEGATIVE beliefs about Jews, Negro-white differences are small or reversed, with Negroes less anti-Semitic. But, for every 100 whites who said Jews use shady business practices, 145 Negroes gave that response. For every 100 whites who said Jews were not as honest as other businessmen, 129 Negroes said so. Of the five negative beliefs about Jews most accepted by Negroes, four were clearly economic in content. The fifth, that "Jews don't care what happens to anyone but their own kind," was also consistent with the image of Jews as economically exploitative. And, unlike the white population, in which the young are less anti-Semitic, in the black community these beliefs were held by more young Negroes than old.

The sociologists noted, however, that Negroes are rarely anti-Semitic without being anti-white as well. Thus, the stereotypic beliefs about Jewish businessmen seemed to describe "Negro experiences with whites in general and therefore their experiences with Jews in particular."

Given the nature of anti-Semitism and the conditions of economic hardship that persist in the ghetto, it is hardly surprising that economic anti-Semitism has special appeal for Negroes. As an ideology, anti-Semitism blames Jews for social and economic ills. In a society where anti-Semitic beliefs are indigenous and in which Jews are prominent part of the ghetto economy, it would b nothing short of miraculous to find Negro immune to economic anti-Semitism.

TWO IMPORTANT THREADS runnin through this sociological assessment were (1) tha the danger of current anti-Semitism stems not from its virulence but from widespread indifference to it and (2) that the acceptance of negative beliefs about a minority group and the lack of principled opposition to bigotry are both strongly and inversely related to education, which can be the primary countervailing influence.

If, as seems likely, these findings may be applied as well to other forms of prejudice as to anti-Semitism, they are an important danger signal not only to Jews, but to every other "minority group" – and, indeed, to every American who is alert to the vital importance of the search for community in this country. What we seem to have now is, at best, mere outward, superficial conformity to the official morality's prohibition of prejudice. It is not acceptance of difference, but passive and utilitarian tolerance, easily shed when self-interest or the interest of one's own group seems to dictate.

INSOFAR AS EDUCATION takes place in schools, the warning here is that the nation needs a better job done, not only in terms of more education for more people, but also in terms of content. Generally speaking, prejudicial beliefs are accepted without question by those – black, white, brown, red, Jew, or Gentile – who lack the knowledge and criteria for rejecting them. Formal education is no cure-all, and "shotgun educational campaigns" to eliminate prejudice alone will not be effective. It is vitally important to America that our history texts be made more honest and that the rich variety of cultural streams represented in the citizenry be positively appreciated. It is equally important that children and young people, from kindergarten through college, see representatives of these streams among teachers, administrators and other leaders in the educational enterprise. A strong commitment to democratic principles cannot be learned by rote. Our true principles are communicated subliminally and commitment to them comes by contagion.

But what takes place in schools is not, of course, the whole of anyone's education. If the danger of prejudice "stems not from its virulence but from widespread indifference to it" and a "lack of principled opposition to bigotry," it is important that leaders in every ethnic or racial community (and "leaders" includes parents and other informal molders of attitudes) oppose prejudice and discrimination wherever and against whomever it appears.

PREJUDICE IS A treacherous beast. That man is a fool who stands idly by while his neighbor's ox is gored.

Thoughts on the Dominant American

By MILDRED DICKEMAN

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE and literature of America are redundantly concerned with the fates and fortunes of "minorities." These "ethnic" groups, immigrant and indigenous, seem, in our sociological landscape, to be striving upward against each other as though engaged in some pure contest of athletic prowess. Largely absent from our social consciousness is that model and goal of their longings, that object of their rejections and hostilities, the social group which in great degree determines their fates and attempts to define their values, the "non-minority," "non-ethnic" class. It is, of course, this dominant segment of our society which has produced most of our bird's-eye social science, though very little of our fiction since Hawthorne and Melville. If the sociology of power is largely unwritten in this country, if serious studies of the upper class, the executive, the politician, the suburbanite and the White racist are almost non-existent, that is merely a reflection of the fact that American society as a whole has not yet begun to think in terms of the relationship between class, power and the political and social control of subordinate groups.

Only in our American mythology do we find some image, however distorted, of this critical segment of our society. There, in TV and textbooks, all (with the exception of certain recent tokenisms) appear to be members of this fortunate class, free, White, innocent and vigorous, inheritors of everything, violently achieving law, order and justice, whether in the Old West of cowboy and pioneer or in the New West of urban politics and crime. Clearly, this is a mythology of, by and for the dominant "majority," although it just as clearly has significant functions in relation to those other groups whose experiences are so markedly absent from its conventions. It may be that the social science of America is, by and large, a more sophisticated mythology, designed to provide the intellectual elite of the dominant class with a more elaborate (though not inevitably more accurate) set of guidelines for the comprehension and control of subordinate classes. Most of American fiction, on the other hand, is evidently a protest on the part of members of subordinate social groups against the unreality of our dominant myths. Mythology, social science, literature: their diversities, even incompatibilities, suggest some strange qualities to the American experience.

LOOKING FROM THIS PERSPECTIVE at American views of ourselves, we discover the inadequacies of our social vocabulary, and suspect that behind them lies an inadequacy of comprehension. If the terms "ethnic" and "minority" are as absurd in their American usages as the term "race" which they have displaced, at least there is some agreement about the social units to which these terms refer. If there is anything upon which America agrees, it is upon what constitutes a "minority," even though we may insist upon euphemisms to designate what is in fact a politically deprived, effectively disfranchised social class or caste in a greater or lesser state of oppression. What we do not agree on, at least we of the dominant class, is who *we* are. Our labels, definitions, boundaries, values are all undefined and undescribed. "Majority," "White," "middle-class" (our terms for ourselves) or "WASP," "Anglo" (others' terms for us) – none of these is true. None of them conveys the critical fact that it is we who have access to power in this society, nor do they reflect with accuracy the origins and composition of our class.

We think of ourselves most easily as descendants of those early European immigrants who achieved political control by virtue of their dates of arrival, their organization, and their links with the seats of power in their homelands. But they were not the only early immigrants, and besides, some of their descendants no longer qualify. Ejected from status and power, products of a process of downward mobility (and where is the sociology of this phenomenon?), they are, like all minorities, researched, and romanticized, the Appalachians, Ozarkians and Okies, the only Anglo-Saxons whom we accept as folk.

But that is not the whole of our history. We constitute as well the descendants of those groups

especially favored by the racial philosophy (and consequent immigration laws) of the first dominant European settlers. Our terms of service were short, because our eyes were blue, and we soon came to be co-equals within the dominant class. We do not talk about it much, but some of our brothers and cousins, too, rejected or rejecting, have remained "ethnic" and partially alien. They serve us, handily, in their "stable working-class" enclaves, when we need a scapegoat to assume responsibility for that vulgar phenomenon known as White racism. (Interesting, that adjective, as though most racism in this society were other than White.)

But that is still not all of us. We are composed as well of members of all those other subordinate groups, individuals who by dint of fortune and conformity have been accepted into the ranks of power, though in some cases only the lower ranks: the Jewish scientists and Italian mayors and Irish school teachers. This is neither unique nor surprising. Any ruling dynasty which cannot replace itself from generation to generation, or whose members cannot meet the increased governmental needs of an expanding society, must adopt members into its ranks to fill the required roles. Significantly, in our America, the proportions of members derived from each subordinate subgroup reflect rather accurately, not the proportions of those groups within the society as a whole, but rather the rank of each such subgroup within the "racial" hierarchy of the dominant philosophy. If this strange relation between ease of adoption and relative rank were to be seen as the product of individual striving alone, and in no way due to chance or to the imposition of differential social restraints, then it could only be understood as a confirmation of the theory of racially inherited intelligence and morality which is the ultimate philosophical root of the American social experience. And that is how it has always been told to us. Because we were genetically chosen, we succeeded and were adopted.

FOR THOSE WHO PREFER visual models, "racial" success in America can be conceived geographically with equal accuracy, by measuring the geographic distance of any group's original homeland from that hypothetical Anglo-Saxon navel of the world and center of purity, graced with total intelligence, blondism and freedom to immigrate, which must lie somewhere in the Dogger Banks of the North Sea, halfway between London and Amsterdam. America and Africa, so distant from the hypothetical pole of purity as to be incomprehensible to this philosophy, fell to the bottom of the hierarchy, and their descendants have been vying ever since, all across America, for the lowest rung on the ladder. It is perhaps not inappropriate to recall at this point that alternate American myth, for those who shy away from the social Darwinism of genetic endowment as a determinant of success, which explains the degree of upward mobility into the dominant class as merely a consequence of the specific subgroup's length of stay in this country. What this latter myth tells us, after all, is not that Africans and American Indians have just arrived on our shores, but rather that they are recent immigrants into the consciousness of the dominant American, as human beings who have claims and aspirations in this society.

IF THE DOMINANT CLASS in our society is composed in good part of members adopted from out of the subordinate classes and castes, then one of the most significant of American experiences must surely be the experience of adoption, of upward mobility on the one hand, or of rejection and the retention of ethnicity on the other. Only in our literature, largely the product of minority group members in the process of adjustment to the American society, can we find any attention to these two important and painful human experiences. Our public mass media, including our school textbooks, do not recognize them, although these experiences are probably more determining of the perceptions and behavior of the dominant American than any other aspect of American history. We speak, it is true, of upward mobility, though we never speak of the causes and personal consequences of that experience. But that

there is a process of rejection, as well as one of acceptance or assimilation, and that the consequence of that process is the preservation of ethnic communities which are generations old, in every city in America, remains unspoken. In so far as we know anything of that process of rejection, we may suspect that it is a two-way process of refusal by both subgroup member and dominant class. As we will see, the school "drop-out" (another American euphemism) is not only a paradigm of this process, but one of the major modes of rejection. An individual who is told from his early years that he does not qualify, and can never fully qualify, may come to feel that the rewards for uncertain semi-qualification are tenuous indeed, and the rejection will be mutual.

HOWEVER, SINCE WE ARE concerned here with the character of the dominant American, rather than with his rejected brother, a few observations on the "successful life history" will suggest its importance for the subsequent personality of the adopted individual. There are two aspects of the process which merit attention, namely certain requirements for adoption (beyond the merely "racial"), and certain qualities of the adopting class. To move into the class of dominant Americans, an individual must abandon his ethnicity. Actually those aspects of his ethnic origin which may be retained and those which must be discarded are rather carefully defined, certain modified culinary and musical preferences being allowable, as are certain last names. But the language or dialect of the subordinate American, his philosophic and religious system and hence the basic personality of the minority member must all be abandoned. This cultural rejection is, of course, engaged in within an emotion-laden context, in which the rejected "ethnic" items of behavior are seen as marks of inferiority, even though they were learned and internalized primarily in one's own home and from one's immediate family.

But there is more to this process of rejection than a cultural denial. Since by no means all members of each subordinate community are adopted into the dominant class, then each individual who rises from out of his ethnic community must engage in a *social* as well as a cultural rejection. As he discards his inferior cultural behaviors and values, he must also discard the community and kin who cannot or will not travel upward with him, and cast off along with them all those feelings of kinship, obligation and responsibility which defined him as a participant in a community. Again, he can do so only by defining these kin ties and responsibilities as marks of inferiority and failure, and by defining those family and friends who persist in maintaining them as weak, hopeless, lacking in achievement orientation and self-discipline. (Self-discipline, in the American sense at least, is the refusal to be influenced by others.) Thus each individual is caught in that most truly American dilemma: whether to discard his own family and community, and reject his emotional involvement with them, or to forfeit the possibility of social and economic advancement. To be fully American, one must have said a firm "no" to his family and traditions, or one must be a descendant of someone who has done so.

Thus the experience of "Americanization," which binds most members of the dominant class together, is a process of deep social and cultural alienation. Surely this process must leave its mark on the personalities of all who undergo it, and upon their offspring. I suspect that two widespread American personality traits are derivative of it. The first is a tendency to romanticize the "ethnic" community, to see "folk" cultures as the only valid sources of new cultural forms (music, dance, food, colloquial speech), and to see "minority" members and the lower class in general as the only real or beautiful people in the society, the only source of authenticity. We will return later to this romanticizing tendency. More important is that the experience of rejection and alienation results, in dominant Americans, in an incapacity for empathy which is the necessary concomitant of our extreme cultural and racial intolerance and ethnocentricity. Surely it is impossible for an individual to abandon his most deeply held values and practices and his closest personal

relations without destroying, in the process, most of his capacity for human response to the fate of others.

TURNING TO THE ADOPTING class, the dominant society itself, a new question arises. If the majority of entering members of this class have discarded their own values and behaviors in the process of entry, or are offspring of individuals who have done so, then what is the source of the values and behavior patterns of the dominant class? That they derive primarily from the "founding fathers" and the "Puritan ethnic" is probably as mythic as our belief that we all disembarked from the Mayflower. Surely we are not 17th century New England Puritans, and too few of us are descendants of the Anglo-Saxon elite to have preserved many of those values intact. Unfortunately there is no adequate study of the creation and evolution of the American value system. We may, however, get some idea of the source of dominant American values if we look at those areas of society which have as their primary or secondary function the inculcation of dominant values into the young, the subordinate and the immigrant American.

These are public institutions. The home, of course, will not do, for the home is the source of those traditional values which must be rejected. Dominant American values are institutional values transmitted by institutions maintained and supervised by members of the dominant class, and concerned with several related functions. First, they are screening agencies. They determine which individuals may and may not move upward into the dominant society. Those who may not advance are so labelled by a variety of techniques, so that society may know them (the "truant," "dropout," "delinquent," "underachiever," and "problem child"), while others are prepared for adoption into what it pleases dominant Americans to term the "wider society." The upward bound are inculcated with a thorough allegiance to the values and attitudes of the dominant class, but in all must be imbued at least minimal respect for members of the dominant society and recognition of the dominant values.

Thus the maintenance of dominance and the recruitment of new members are the primary functions of these socializing, or more accurately "re-socializing" institutions, the most important of which is of course the school, with others such as the army playing secondary roles. Yet in the process of transmission, these institutions are engaged in the creation of new values. No one knows in any detail the sources of these values still in the process of emergence. However, since most of the individuals employed by these institutions derive from subordinate group backgrounds, and since they must deal with individuals coming out of a wide variety of value systems, it is likely that the dominant American values are compromise values which allow channelling of large numbers of disparate individuals into a new mass society. That empathy, for example, is not a major value in our society, while self-control is, probably has more to do with the institutions designing our values, the origins of their staff members, and the large numbers of individuals who must pass through them, than it has to do with any "Puritan" origins of American culture. The major source of school teachers in our society has always been those ethnic minority members seeking admission to the lowest levels of the dominant society, and the major incentive to teaching has always been upward mobility which, as we have seen, involves a process of alienation. This is the central locus of the "melting pot."

THIS PUBLIC, INSTITUTIONAL creation of values means, surprisingly, that American youth are being inculcated with attitudes and behaviors which have no roots at all, but are artificial in the sense that no human community has ever lived them as a traditional system. Only in so far as an emergent suburban middle class is putting them into practice can they be said to be alive. And the individual who "assimilates" into dominant America is not, in fact, being assimilated into a society in the usual sense at all. He does not move into an established community and learn its traditional ways through association with its members. Rather, he is formally indoctrinated in acceptable behaviors, by school and church and

army and job. The "community" which he joins, if he is successful, is a conglomerate of alienated, rejecting, publically socialized individuals like himself.

This experience and, equally importantly, our public denial of it, lies at the root of the "American" personality; and the racism, both institutional and personal, in our society, cannot be understood without an examination of it. While the problems of subordinate groups in our society may consist in large part of what we have done to them, the true "problem" of the dominant American consists of his unacknowledged heritage of self-alienation and self-deceit.

* * *

AS ONE ASPECT of the long discussion concerning the achievement of equal rights in this country, there was in the recent past a dispute about the relative effectiveness of legal, as against psychological, means of reform. Those who maintained on one side that laws could not change the minds of men underestimated the effects of habitual behavior, and may often have taken their position out of a desire to avoid any restructuring of society at all. Nevertheless, they rightly saw that there are limits to the coercive powers of the law, and even greater limits to the degree of lasting psychological change brought about by mere association. Those on the other side saw the necessity for immediate action, and correctly maintained that although justice may not be tolerance, and tolerance may not be love, it is intolerable to deny justice because we cannot give love. Indeed, they came to understand that those demanding justice did not necessarily desire our tolerance or our love.

This argument has died, and those who upheld the necessity for legal action in the absence of changes of the heart, have carried the day. Yet the question may still remain, for it is clear by now that even though the legalists may have triumphed, little legal reform has emerged. What new legislation has resulted is threatened at every turn by attempts to weaken and abrogate it, and lacks vigorous implementation and enforcement at all levels of government. And this is very simply because the hearts of those in power are "not in it."

To effect these changes in American society, political pressure alone would have to be powerful and sustained. No single ethnic subgroup could mount such continuous and irresistible pressure. For reform to be continuous, evolving, built into the structure of American governmental and economic life, there must be leaders who will ensure that change be pursued. Indeed, those qualities which guarantee a commitment to change may be necessary not only for governmental leaders, but for all those powerful "White allies" who may be sought by subordinate groups seeking change, those disaffected members of the dominant society who are still potentially influential.

IN TERMS OF THE PREVIOUS discussion, it may not be at all necessary for most Americans to be tolerant or unbiassed in order for our society to achieve a greater degree of justice and equality between individuals and between groups. But it may well be absolutely necessary for those in power to understand the roots of their own intolerance, and its source in that American experience which has been outlined above, in order that they have a sufficient, and sufficiently lasting, commitment to social reform. For that reform, if successful, must recreate American society in a way which will spell the end of all the mythologies, assumptions and definitions discussed before. Social justice can only mean the end of alienation as a requisite to success.

We dominant Americans have been told time and again by activist leaders of subordinate groups that our primary responsibility is to organize within our own communities. This admonition takes on a special strength and meaning if we grant the need for self-awareness in political leaders and workers within the dominant society. We may begin now to understand why we have been so tardy in turning our political, as well as our sociological, attention to our own society, as we also begin to understand what kinds of means and goals may be implicit in that "organizing" in which we must engage.

Accepting this necessity, we will find no psychology of enlightenment to assist us in the production of new kinds of dominant Americans. But we may enquire, initially, into the histories of those who have begun to dissociate themselves from the myths and values of their indoctrination, and to look with critical eyes at the process of Americanization. Such a history probably begins most often as a consequence of a significant failure of our mythology. None of it, popular or social scientific, provides an adequate explanation for the violence done to human beings in our society. Not that mythological systems need be true; they need only be convincing. In our society, an individual confronting for the first time and at first hand the degradation and brutality which is intrinsic to our melting pot is in great danger of losing faith in the religion of America. This of course is why our society takes such great pains to separate its dominant social group from the realities of life as it is lived below. All the elaborate mechanisms of avoidance, segregation and deceit have as only one of their functions the maintenance of subordinate individuals in their unearned "place." The other, equally important, function of these mechanisms is to protect members of the dominant class from the necessity for too frequent or too searching questions about the nature of things as they are.

PREDICTABLY, IT IS NOT often those who have themselves just passed through the process of alienation who become disaffected by this experience. They have too much, too new, to lose; their security in their new group is too uncertain; and they have learned too well that to respond in human terms is to jeopardize their own prospects of upward success. Rather it is more likely to be those who can afford to risk a little, the more securely middle-class, the second generation for whom the process of indoctrination has been less personally brutal, the young who insist on consistency. For such a person, the process of self-discovery probably begins with an emotional shock: he perceives in a vague way that he has been denied knowledge of some rather basic aspects of human and social reality. Since he does not yet know precisely what they are, nor how he got that way, and there is little or nothing in the common terms and understandings of American discourse to assist him to insight, his response often includes an attempt to acquire, to absorb and adopt, those characteristics of subordinate groups which he now perceives to be lacking in his own society. Thus, paradoxically the shock of contact with the life of another group, a shock which involves some recognition of its mistreatment by his own dominant class, results in a romantic attraction to it which seems to deny the very brutal and painful aspects of its existence which awakened him initially.

In fact it is not so surprising. The obverse of romantic xenophilia has always been an unresolved shame, guilt and rejection of one's self and one's own. He who first discovers the horrors of his own heritage, after years of believing he has nothing to be ashamed of, responds initially by rejecting that heritage. Where else would he turn but to those others, those "ethnic" societies which his own group so despises? Today, a great deal of American popular and commercial culture caters to this romantic infatuation with "ethnicity." Almost everyone is a folknik; we are all connoisseurs of chili and chitt'lin's. And as any minority group member knows, romantic fascination contains large amounts of blindness, condescension and hidden insult. Romanticism essentially is the substitution of sentimentality and cuteness for a mature understanding of the uneven good and bad of human life; it substitutes contrived and poorly understood allegiances to out-groups for the harder task of resolving one's irreversible affiliation with a history which one cannot totally approve. An unfortunate consequence is that romantics are as likely to legislate and prescribe solutions for the needs of others as are hard-core dominant Americans, and their benevolent intentions may be a good deal harder to stomach than the honestly self-seeking strategies of the latter.

WHY SHOULD IT BE necessary to examine the characteristics and prospects of this peculiar American romantic? First, and most

optimistically, because it may be that the increasing romanticism of American popular culture, with all its dangers of new stereotypy, is a sign that large numbers of dominant Americans have begun to take the first steps away from an unquestioning allegiance to the myth of American mobility. Second and more important, it is evident that the single largest source of so-called "White allies" is this group of disaffected romantics. We are accustomed to the term "liberal," and all the negative connotations which that term has acquired in recent years are a consequence of just this interplay between sentimentality and guilt. An assessment of the value and the role of this group in the struggle for equality in America must involve some understanding of its origins, capacities and limitations.

Responding vigorously, if naively, to a sense of shock and shame, it was we who provided, since the earliest days of the civil rights movement, the workers who could represent and reach the conscience of White America, and bring back some broader comprehension of the facts of American society. Our weaknesses are familiar by now: our tendency to idealize poverty and pain, our often intense hate for the members of our own society which so reduced our political effectiveness within our own group, our too easy acquiescence to the habits of dominance and command, our longings for gratitude and our childish hurt in its absence. And of course our unevenness, our willingness to take only the bold and brilliant public risks but not the long and private hardships. Much of it was a simple inability to listen, that lost empathic art which we had not yet re-acquired. Whatever our value, our romantic incentives were faulty, and half an incentive makes only half an activist.

Yet these are still the allies, and those who are convinced of the need for them in achieving political and social change will have to rely for some time upon such individuals. He will be wise to learn who they are and how to use them.

WHAT IT IS THAT HOLDS the member of dominant society back from involvement in the reform of his own group is surely evident by now. Going home is a long journey, never as the crow flies, and the post-romantic stages are the hardest. They are also more difficult to describe but consist, I think, in large part of two processes: listening and self-acceptance. The escape from romanticism involves a slow, probably lifelong process of examination of one's own habitual patterns of thought and reaction, one's daily stereotypes. To begin this process is to experience continual surprise at the pervasiveness of the ethnocentric, "racist," and hierarchical premises which underlie the patterns of Western thought and the structure of Western institutions. The unavoidable correlate is that these pervasive premises lie also at the center of one's own personality, and that there is probably *no* unprejudiced member of dominant America who has not undergone an intentional process of "unprejudicing" himself. That is difficult therapy.

Listening, then, involves listening to one's own natural assumptions with increasing scepticism, and consequently hearing the members of one's own community with increasing distress.

But it means something more important and more difficult as well. Since there are no established guidelines within the dominant class for this process of re-examination, few individuals and few statements which can serve as signposts along the way, one turns inevitably to those individuals in our society who possess a perspective other than one's own, the only Americans not completely indoctrinated, mythologized, "Americanized," the members of subordinate groups. One begins to hear what it is they have been saying for so long, on the other side of that sound-proof, one-way pane of glass that has divided us all from each other. It is an uncomfortable fact that dominant Americans who would free themselves from the ethnocentrisms of their heritage desperately need the assistance of those who have seen America from the other side. Whether minority group members will care to play this role of guidance and correction is a question I cannot answer, but I am convinced that the dominant American will never be free without it.

AND ONE COMES, FINALLY, to acceptance. In the last analysis, we are who we are in good part as a consequence of our own heritage, and we cannot trade traditions. It is only after we accept the difficult facts of our own heritage, and our own personal history, and make our peace with them, that we are able at last to discard that romanticism which is an escape from self-knowledge, and to begin to work effectively within our own society. It is doubtful whether we can program such personal changes for dominant Americans. Yet they may be necessary, at least for those critical individuals in positions of influence. Those who have begun to stumble along the path of personal reassessment surely have a prime responsibility to assist their own brothers to a recognition of the roots of their alienation, and to an examination of their heritage of racism. This responsibility is, I believe, the only valid "White man's burden."

About the Authors

WILLIE L. BROWN, JR., is an Assemblyman from the Eighteenth District (San Francisco) in the California Legislature. Born in Mineola, Texas, Mr. Brown is a graduate of San Francisco State College (B.A., 1955) and Hastings College of Law, University of California, where he was elected Permanent President of the Class of 1958. He was admitted to the State Bar in 1959 and to practice before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1964. Recipient of a press award as the "Outstanding Freshman Legislator of 1965," he is now Democratic Whip in the California Assembly.

JORGE LARA-BRAUD, Director of the Hispanic-American Institute, was born in Mexicali, Baja California. He received a B.A. in philosophy in 1954 from Austin College, Sherman, Texas. After graduate study in political science at Texas A & I University, he entered Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, where he received his Bachelor of Divinity degree with highest honors in 1959. He has completed residence requirements toward a Doctor of Theology degree at Princeton Seminary. Dr. Lara-Braud is a member of the Latin American Studies Association, the Advisory Council on Inter-American Affairs of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., the Texas Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, and the National Board of Directors of Planned Parenthood-World Population. He has written a number of books and articles dealing with Latin American and Inter-American affairs.

VINE DELORIA, JR., of Denver, Colorado, is a member of the Standing Rock Sioux tribe, and was born in Martin, South Dakota. He holds a B.S. degree from Iowa State University (1958) and a Bachelor of Divinity degree from Lutheran School of Theology, Rock Island, Illinois (1963). He is now a senior in the School of Law, University of Colorado. Mr. Deloria served for three years as Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians and is the author of *Custer Died For Your Sins,* which was published in 1969. A second book by Mr. Deloria, soon to be published, deals in part with Indian tribal sovereignty and the importance of group-identity for minority Americans.

THEODORE FREEDMAN, Southern Director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, resides in Houston, Texas. Born on Staten Island, New York, he is a graduate of Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, where he majored in psychology and sociology. As an instructor at Richmond Professional Institute in Virginia in 1953-54, Mr. Freedman taught courses on "Human Relations Among Groups and Cultures" and "Group Dynamics and Democratic Leadership." He has lectured on intergroup relations at colleges and universities throughout the South.

MILDRED DICKEMAN lives in Berkeley and is Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California. She is a graduate of the University of Michigan and received her Ph.D. from the University of California at Berkeley in 1958. As an Assistant Professor at the University of Kansas, she served as Associate Director of that university's Indian Education Project in 1966-67. She is a member of Phi Beta Kappa and a Fellow of the American Anthropological Society.